

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

IRMA ROKNICH,

Plaintiff,

v.

TARGET CORPORATION,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:19-cv-00418-GMN-CWH

**ORDER**

Presently before the court is the parties' proposed joint discovery plan and scheduling order (ECF No. 7), filed on April 10, 2019. Under Local Rule 26-1, discovery plans must include a certification that the parties "met and conferred about the possibility of using alternative dispute-resolution processes including mediation, arbitration, and if applicable, early neutral evaluation." LR 26-1(b)(7). The parties must certify that "that they considered consent to trial by a magistrate judge . . . ." LR 26-1(b)(8). Further, a discovery plan proposing longer deadlines "must state on its face 'SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED'." LR 26-1(a). The proposed plan must include a statement of the reasons why longer deadlines are requested. *Id.*

Here, the parties fail to certify that they considered alternative dispute resolution and trial by a Magistrate Judge. Additionally, the parties request 270 days for discovery, but fail to state that special scheduling review is requested and fail to include a statement of reasons why longer discovery deadlines should apply to this case. The court will therefore deny the proposed discovery plan for failure to comply with the Local Rules.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the parties' proposed joint discovery plan and scheduling order (ECF No. 7) is DENIED without prejudice.

DATED: April 23, 2019

  
C.W. HOFFMAN, JR.  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE